

Utah State Building Board & Utah State Board of Regents



Joint Meeting
September 13, 2002

MINUTES

Utah State Building Board Members in attendance:

Keith Stepan, Chair
Manuel Torres
Larry Jardine
Kerry Casaday

Utah State Board of Regents in attendance:

Nolan E. Karras, Chair
Jerry C. Atkin
Linnea S. Barney
Kim R. Burningham
Khay Douangdara
L. Brent Hoggan
James S. Jardine
Michael R. Jensen
E. George Mantes
Jed H. Pitcher
Sara V. Sinclair
Marlon O. Snow
Maria Sweeten

Others in attendance:

Joseph A. Jenkins
Camille Anthony
Kenneth Nye
Shannon Lofgreen
Kent Beers
Blake Court
John Massey
Cecilia H. Foxley

Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Department of Administrative Services
Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Division of Facilities Construction & Management
Legislative Fiscal Analyst Office
Utah System of Higher Education

David Buhler	Utah System of Higher Education
Chalmers Gail Norris	Utah System of Higher Education
Mark Spencer	Utah System of Higher Education
Joyce Cottrell	Utah System of Higher Education
Deanna D. Winn	Utah System of Higher Education
Harden R. Eyring	Utah System of Higher Education
Linda Fife	Utah System of Higher Education
Jerry H. Fullmer	Utah System of Higher Education
Brad Mortensen	Utah System of Higher Education
Phyllis C. Safman	Utah System of Higher Education
Gary S. Wixom	Utah System of Higher Education
J. Bernard Machen	University of Utah
Dr. A. Lorris Betz	University of Utah
Paul T. Brinkman	University of Utah
Michael G. Perez	University of Utah
Bill Edwards	University of Utah
Arnold Combe	University of Utah
Kermit Hall	Utah State University
Stan Albrecht	Utah State University
Lee H. Burke	Utah State University
Celestial Starr Bybee	Utah State University
David Cowley	Utah State University
Sue Guenter-Schlesinger	Utah State University
Darrell E. Hart	Utah State University
Fred R. Hunsaker	Utah State University
Richard W. Jacobs	Utah State University
Thomas L. Kent	Utah State University
Brent C. Miller	Utah State University
Craig J. Simper	Utah State University
Kevin C. Womack	Utah State University
Dave Cowley	Utah State University
Paul H. Thompson	Weber State University
F. Ann Millner	Weber State University
Norman C. Tarbox, Jr.	Weber State University
Dave Eisler	Weber State University
Steven D. Bennion	Southern Utah University
Abe Harraf	Southern Utah University
Gregory Stauffer	Southern Utah University
Michael T. Benson	Snow College
Gary C. Arnoldson	Snow College
Diane Murphy-Martin	Snow College
Rick Wheeler	Snow College
Robert C. Huddleston	Dixie State College

Stanley J. Plewe	Dixie State College
Ben Joe Markland	Dixie State College
Ryan L. Thomas	College of Eastern Utah
Raelene Allred	College of Eastern Utah
Dennis Geary	College of Eastern Utah
Lucille T. Stoddard	Utah Valley State College
Linda Makin	Utah Valley State College
James L. Michaelis	Utah Valley State College
Val Peterson	Utah Valley State College
H. Lynn Cundiff	Salt Lake Community College
Judd H. Morgan	Salt Lake Community College
Gordon Storrs	Salt Lake Community College
Gregory G. Fitch	Utah College of Applied Technology
Collette Mercier	Utah College of Applied Technology
Cheryl Buchta	Standard Examiner
Kirsten Stewart	Salt Lake Tribune
Twila Van Leer	Deseret News
Race Davies	Governor's Office of Planning and Budget
Representative Loraine Pace	House of Representatives
Senator Beverly Evans	Senate
John Massey	Legislative Fiscal Analyst
Boyd Garrett	Legislative Fiscal Analyst
Debbie Headden	Legislative Fiscal Analyst
Jay Greaves	Davis Applied Technology Center
RoLynne Christensen	VCBO Architecture
Jackie McGill	Spectrum + Bennion

On Friday, September 13, 2002, a joint meeting was scheduled between the Utah State Building Board and the Board of Regents at Utah State University, Taggart Student Center Ballroom. Chair Nolan Karras of the Board of Regents called the meeting to order at 8:05am and requested introductions from the participants.

❑ USHE – LONG TERM ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS.....

Mark Spencer referred the audience to Tab I regarding the USHE 2002 long-term enrollment projections. The enrollment projections were based on several items with the two key factors being the state population estimates and the historical participation rates by two age categories. The two driving inputs were received from the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, and revised population estimates were used for two cohorts aged 18-29 and age 30 and above. Mr. Spencer explained there had been a recent spurt of growth at approximately 4%, which slightly tapered off to 1.2% for three years before leveling off.

The population projection graph identified the 2002 estimate and the 2002 revised estimate and provided a better determination of whether or not the participation rates would increase. Items that may affect participation rates included changes in demand of the workforce or training, changes in accessibility, changes similar to HB331, changes in funding patterns, and changes in technology. The largest category participation rate aged 18-29 is expected to gradually increase as a larger percentage of that age category will enroll. The participation of the 30 and above age category is expected to remain level, but could change based on economy and workforce patterns.

The 20 year projection system estimated an annual increase of approximately 2.3% over the twenty year period. The first five year period is estimated for a 3.2% increase totaling 5000 new students in the first five year block and approximately 60,000 students over the 20 year period. These estimates will help in planning for space needs and in estimating where the growth will be, but it depends heavily on the population estimates and other factors that may occur.

Chair Nolan Karras stated over the next 20 years, the system will grow from approximately 109,302 to 173,580 which is an estimated growth of 65,000 students within the next 20 years and a cumulative total of 58% increase.

Commissioner Foxley reminded the Boards that the first five years are more accurate than the 20 year prediction. The 20 year prediction is simply to address space, building needs and other long term projections. Some institutions have been very conservative with their projections. Mr. Spencer indicated the directions were good and to bear in mind the fluctuations by institution would be based on the economy.

Chair Keith Stepan questioned out-of-state versus in-state students and the percentage of increases or decreases. Mark Spencer commented they had not factored in the effect of new legislation, but they have factored in existing or historical participation rate by those categories. The out of state percentage for enrollment has been 9 to 11%.

Commissioner Foxley stated the USHE had some preliminary information from some institutions showing out-of-state students decreasing and in-state students increasing. In-state students are offsetting the decline of out-of-state students because of the HB331 impact which basically changed the rules of residency. The out-of-state students did bring in additional tuition dollars causing a decrease in funding.

Mark Spencer stated some of the faster growing institutions needed classroom space, but there was also an urgent need to fund the libraries. Chair Stepan stated the libraries were going to take a majority of the funding available.

☐ SUMMARY OF CURRENT OR RECENTLY COMPLETED CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.....

Commissioner Foxley asked the Presidents to provide a summary on some the projects they had received support of the Building Board in carrying forth and supporting the recommendations to the Legislature and to the Governor. She asked the Presidents to comment on some of their recently funded projects, projects underway, or projects recently completed.

President Robert Huddleston, Dixie State College, spoke on the Gardner Center Food Service Addition for \$5,000,000 which was financed through student fees and a private donation and included some remodeling in addition to the student center. Another project is the Eccles Fine Arts Center which is a 70,000sf facility and the demolition will be completed the week of September 16. The architectural plans are approximately 95% completed and 15 parties have expressed interest. This project had \$3.5 million in private money and \$35-40,000 for O & M committed.

President Lucille Stoddard, UVSC, stated the Engineering Technology Building has made such a great difference on the campus. Currently underway, UVSC has the Wasatch campus and the Liberal Arts Classroom. The Liberal Arts Classroom will house faculty and classrooms and aid in relieving some of the pressure. Chair Keith Stepan added this project is also part of a standard plan for four classroom projects DFCM developed in terms of getting space for an economical price. The Wasatch campus is expected to be completed in the fall of 2003.

President Ryan Thomas, CEU, thanked the Board for the funding for the replacement of their main building as the 65 year old facility was literally falling down. The new facility is well underway, with most of the metal work being completed. CEU anticipated the building would be ready in June 2003 and ready for occupancy for next fall.

President Kermit Hall, USU, stated the projects recently completed at Utah State included the Roosevelt campus facility. USU also recently completed the central energy facility which not only has state of the art boilers, but also has the potential to do cogeneration. President Hall was impressed with the tunneling which, if stood on top of each other, would be four times taller than the Sears tower in Chicago. In terms of projects currently underway, USU has the programming phase of the Merrill library nearing completion and anticipate on presenting a design for the building when the legislative session begins. With the help from private donations, the Edith Bowen School replacement has allowed USU to replace

approximately half of the facility to result in an extremely remarkable facility with a great deal of technology to serve as a model facility for schools K-5 in Utah. USU was very grateful for the support of the Board and especially grateful for Joseph Jenkins' input in working with the library project.

President Paul H. Thompson of Weber State University expressed gratitude for the Ethel Wattis Kimball Visual Arts building and all that was done to make it possible. The building was privately funded and is serving the students, faculty and community very well. The Stewart Stadium expansion was also privately funded by the Stewart Education Foundation and WSU was very grateful for Elizabeth Stewart and her support and the foundation's support. The new student housing was completed in August and students are currently residing in the housing. The housing was bonded enabling the three buildings to be built with non-state funds. He expressed appreciation for DFCM for their work, beautiful buildings being on time, and always serving their needs. Currently underway is the Davis campus building, which is moving along very well and will be completed in August of 2003.

President Michael Benson, Snow College, noted the impact the George S. and Dora Eccles Center for the Performing Arts will have not only on the campus, but also on the entire Sanpete County area. The firm selected to do the construction contracted a 19 month project down to 14 months allowing Snow College to take possession of this building next August in time for fall semester 2003. Five buildings will be raised allowing the College to use the O&M from those buildings for this building. The new Performing Arts Center will house two performing halls, a concert hall and a theater. He expressed his gratitude toward the Building Board as the building means an enormous deal to Snow College.

President Steven Bennion thanked the Building Board for the new Gale Sorenson Physical Education building which was completed 18 months ago and has been a wonderful addition to the campus. SUU has had a long standing physical education program of excellence and is sometimes dubbed the teaching and coaching factory due to the coaches and teachers throughout the state of Utah. SUU completed the project on a quality based approach which encouraged a great building and showed teamwork. Projects currently underway included the large Shakespeare center which, due to the economy, has been slightly delayed but SUU continues to proceed with some aspects and are excited about the Festival and its growing facilities. Another project is the Eccles Living and Learning Center which will be funded by bonds and also a private gift from the George and Delores Eccles foundation of \$2 million. Program planning is nearing completion and ground breaking is hoped in the near future.

Dr. Lorris Betz, University of Utah, stated that on behalf of President Machen, he thanked the Building Board for projects recently completed or underway. The student housing in Fort Douglas has allowed the University to completely replace the old housing with brand new student housing on the campus with magnificent state-of-the-art facilities. The University

was extremely thrilled the project assisted in showing themselves to the world as well as they did and also provide very good housing to the students. The Christensen Center and the Cowles building renovation are also significant classroom buildings. The C. Roland Christensen Center building is a state-of-art building and the Cowles building is mostly a renovation with a new addition. With the support of the Emma Eccles Jones Foundation, the University will have the ability to build a substantial new medical sciences research building on the Health Sciences campus. In conjunction with the health sciences education building, a state funded project, these are two important blocks in helping to relocate out of the old School of Medicine which has some life and safety issues.

President Lynn Cundiff, Salt Lake Community College, expressed appreciation for the support of the Building Board and the Board of Regents. After the Building Board toured the Jordan campus, he felt they were fairly familiar with where they stood as an institution. With the Jordan Campus High Technology being open for the last year and a half, their enrollments have increased 100%. The Applied Education Center is open however SLCC continues to struggle with construction being finalized as the construction is not complete to the SLCC's satisfaction. The Redwood Campus College Center addition and renovation is halfway completed and a ribbon cutting ceremony was held this fall. They are still completing the square footage upstairs within the next year which will house a multicultural center in a one stop shop for registration. If the students also agree to bond, SLCC will redo the entire cafeteria in that particular facility as part of the major expansion of the Student Center. The Jordan campus student activity center ribbon cutting was held last spring and students are currently using the facility. The Jordan School District has co-located a facility on the campus as well and currently has 400 high school students in the particular facility that travel between SLCC and Jordan High School. President Cundiff thought SLCC was within two years of requesting another building to be put on that site to jointly co-locate and are proposing a new century school as well. This is also the proposed location for the Health Sciences Center with hopes to have a similar relationship with the Jordan School District. He appreciated the support received in obtaining the buildings and continuing support with regard to facilities and student services.

Chair Keith Stepan stated the list contains quality projects that have been long standing needs and the Value Based Selection process for architects and contractors seemed to be working very well with good reports being received. If that is not the case, the Building Board would be pleased to hear from the agencies if there are needs that can be improved. The Board wished to provide quality selection processes as well as quality service, which has greatly improved recently.

☐ **REGENTS CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES FOR 2003-2004**

Chair Nolan Karras reported the actions of the Regents capital development priorities for 2003-2004. The Regents voted the USU Merrill Library as their number one project with the University of Utah Marriott Library being ranked as the number two project.

President Greg Fitch, UCAT, spoke on the Uintah Basin ATC which was included in the approval. This project has been requested since 1997 and there is a need for it to serve not only the economic development stimulus in that area, but also the high school students and adult learners. Like several others, the College of Applied Technology recognized the importance of serving all of the state and offered their support and endorsements.

Chair Nolan Karras stated the Q & P process helped the Regents prepare their list, although they did discuss fine tuning the process. They discussed adding centrality to the mission and determining if the Q & P process highlights all of the critical points.

Chair Stepan complimented the Regents on their process as he read through the notes and read the categories. He felt the additional category was good to have the foundation to build off of in order to defend their decisions throughout the process.

Commissioner Foxley pointed out Tab B included new language for the institutional mission centrality issue and program criticality and the high demand areas. She felt it was very helpful for the Building Board and DFCM staff to work with the Regents and USHE to continue to refine and update the Q & P process. A few years ago, the Building Board suggested infrastructure for the central heating and cooling systems. The previous Q & P process did not include additional points for the area, and at the Board's suggestion they now do. The Regents also have another area where the policy had not addressed either mission centrality or program criticality based on high market demand and need. It is a work in progress and the Regents appreciated the Board's input and involvement in fine tuning the policy.

Regent David Jordan stated that in listening to the presentations from the various institutions, several projects were necessitated by buildings maturing to the end of their useful life. DFCM indicated it would be more expensive to renovate buildings and it would be better to demolish and rebuild. He questioned if there was an aging analysis to identify when buildings would reach the point of being ineffective to use any longer.

Joseph Jenkins responded the process implemented by DFCM was called the Condition Assessment program enabling staff to review every building in the state. DFCM has currently completed approximately 85% of all buildings including Higher Education. In the

condition assessment program, DFCM assesses all of the buildings to determine their needs for AR&I and O&M money, the age of the building, and if it would be more cost effective to replace or renovate the building. DFCM continues to do perform the analysis and store the data in a database to identify every completed and evaluated building. DFCM is not getting near enough dollars for capital improvements and, as a consequence, the buildings continue to deteriorate faster than they can be maintained. In the long term, it requires DFCM to replace buildings prematurely. However, if more money was available in AR&I, it may extend the life of those buildings some years.

Regent David Jordan felt it would be interesting for the Board of Regents to see a break out from the statewide database of the Higher Education structures. He thought the process that DFCM followed would be useful to the Legislature in order to weigh useful life issues and funding issues.

Chair Nolan Karras and Mark Spencer will be coordinating a five year projection to identify different alternatives. Chair Karras hoped to include the O&M for operations of buildings to better envision the impact of their building program on the budget because those become mandated costs. Chair Karras invited DFCM to help with the process.

Joseph Jenkins stated DFCM previously made a presentation to the Building Board on the status of the needs assessments and the Universities situations. He felt a similar presentation could be made to the Board of Regents. The Regents confirmed the presentation for October.

Commissioner Foxley added one comment that arose earlier in the meetings in knowing the top two priorities were so costly. She questioned the possibility of the Building Board approving some program planning development funds in some of the other projects to allow them to proceed. They know that the Legislature has had different feelings over the years regarding phase funding, but it really would help as all the projects are all highly needed. The Building Board has their five-year plan and is aware of the other numerous priorities on each of the campuses.

Joseph Jenkins commented the budget situation looks similar for next year. If the funds continue to come into the State of Utah where it is projected, there should be approximately \$100 - \$110 million in cash set aside for the capital budget. If \$50 million is allocated for AR&I or capital improvements as mandated by law, only \$50 million would be left in cash for capital development projects. The Building Board also must fund the Archives building since it must be demolished to allow for the Capitol expansion and renovation. A few proposed sites are up for consideration including the Rio Grande building. The \$10 million Archives project will possibly be the number one priority simply because they have to move and there

is no other choice. With that project, that only leaves \$40-50 million in cash dollars for use on capital development projects. Those decision also depend on the economy and if there is more revenue. Any other projects after the Archives building and the two libraries would need to be done as a bond or some other type of phase funding.

Commissioner Foxley previously spoke with Lynne Ward who had echoed the statement made by Mr. Jenkins. The last two months in terms of growth in revenue collections and job growth are much slower than expected. Coupled with mandated costs needing to be addressed and the high growth coming out into public education, it will be a very tight year. Chair Stepan stated the Building Board had met briefly with some of the Legislative Capital Development Subcommittee members to discuss the process. Though funding is limited, the Board will continue to develop the list for a five year plan and provide the Board a realization of the needs for future years. The process and presentations still bear importance although funding may only allow a few projects to be funded.

Commissioner Foxley reminded the Boards of the bonding options especially with timing and bonding rates.

John Massey stated the preliminary indications of the Tax Commission report showed some major concerns with the personal income tax area. The Legislative Fiscal Analyst's Office felt comfortable with the corporate and sales tax currently, but had some concern with the individual income tax based on two months of activity. That may impact the model used by the Tax Commission based on the levels at the end of the fiscal year, however it is currently too early to make the determination. The growth projected to occur would actually be taking place in the later half of the fiscal year and not the first half. Corporate issues and some military issues were not factored in and have caused some consumer confidence to drop below a level previously thought to aid in sustaining for the first few months. The fiscal year was ended with a surplus of \$700,000. However, the Legislature authorized \$113 million from the Rainy Day Fund and, due to collections and lapsing money, only \$105 million was used. The Rainy Day Fund ended the session with approximately \$10 million, but additional General Fund transfers were required by statute. The Fiscal Analysts Office was being very cautious and very concerned about some issues.

President Steven Bennion asked for expectations of the timetable and magnitude of the Capitol project as it is obviously a huge factor when looking at capital development projects.

Joseph Jenkins responded the Legislature had previously funded the two new buildings and the parking structure as well as being in the process of funding the utilities needed for the heat plant. The Capitol Preservation Board has now selected the contractor and the architect for the Capitol itself and do not anticipate returning this year for any appropriations.

The following year they will return to request \$160 million in appropriations that will need to

be funded on a one time basis or over a three year period.

Chair Nolan Karras commented on the mixture of projects including the two libraries as indicated, the Weber State Swensen gymnasium augmented by private funds, the CEU Fine Arts complex, the UVSC Vineyard Elementary, as well as two health science centers. The Regents may also try to develop a nursing initiative and an education initiative to initiate more money. The health sciences centers at Salt Lake Community College and Dixie State College would be part of that initiative. The teacher initiative would be Southern Utah University teacher education as they provide the second highest number of teachers in the state in graduates. The Snow Classroom Building also has deteriorating classrooms. He felt everything on the list was a high priority. He trusted the Presidents to return to the Building Board in October to present the Regents recommendations.

❑ TAKING CARE OF EXISITING BUILDINGS

Chair Stepan distributed a handout with regard to the facilities condition assessment program discussed earlier recognizing the need for immediate repairs and O&M functions of DFCM. Joseph Jenkins stated that over the past years, the Building Board has been very concerned about the amount of money going into AR&I or capital improvement programs. With the help of Representative Adair, Representative Pace and Senator Evans, they were able to increase the limit two years ago from .9% to 1.1% of the value of the buildings, currently approximately \$50 million. Due to existing tight budget constraints, the Legislature rescinded \$9 million granting DFCM only \$40 million in capital improvement projects. Chair Stepan stated the reduction was basically back to .9%. Every institution was decreased by at least one project and Mr. Jenkins expressed appreciation for the support and understanding throughout the process.

Mr. Jenkins indicated DFCM has currently completed about 85% of the approximately 31 million square feet of space in the State and approximately 25.5 million square feet has been addressed in the assessment program. Of the 85% of the buildings inspected, the immediate need for AR&I or money needed to address the current needs is approximately \$163 million. Based on estimates on the same percentage of buildings not completed, another \$28 million is needed to cover approximately \$129 million of immediate needs. In total buildings, there is approximately \$762 million of needs on buildings inspected for a total of \$900 million of AR&I needing to be addressed over ten years. In ten years, if there is \$50 million a year, they are still considerably behind where they need to be because buildings are not being repaired and new buildings are built prematurely.

Mr. Jenkins referred to a pie chart showing the age of the buildings. As DFCM builds a new

building, the AR&I requirements decrease and the O&M increases. Approximately 61% of the buildings are 1-25 years old, 29% of the buildings are 25-50 years old, and 10% of the buildings are over 50 years old. Every two years, DFCM will go through a rotation and perform a needs assessment on every building on campus. DFCM now has a software system called Facility Focus and are trying to get implement the software on all campuses. The program will identify all of the O&M and AR&I needs in the facility and if they are being completed. DFCM is in the process of visiting each institution and providing training in Facility Focus and within two years it should be implemented for all of the institutions in the state. Chair Stepan encourage the Presidents to talk to their Legislators to ensure the 1.1% is reinstated next year.

Chair Nolan Karras stated the previous presentations previously identified a pattern with buildings built at the beginning of the 1960s which used hallways for cold air return and created fire hazards, and weren't earthquake proof. He questioned if increasing the AR&I to 2-4% would decrease the renovation needed currently. Joseph Jenkins confirmed and thought DFCM was doing a much better job than has been done in the past. One of the biggest problems right now is the technology needed in new buildings which costs slightly more. They are also looking at an internet protocol and must ensure buildings are built to adequately handle the new technology. Chair Stepan added that the national guidelines suggested 2-4% for AR&I and the 1.1% is woefully inadequate, but was a big step forward that could hopefully increase in the future. He thought that the guidelines of 50 years life cycle for a building were sufficient in terms of upfront cost versus future costs since the systems wear out and the technology and information that architects use to design buildings increases so rapidly now.

Kenneth Nye, DFCM, stated the only substantial building more than 50 years old not in the Higher Education system is the State Capitol. Although just 10% of the State's buildings are more than 50 years old, virtually all of those are in the Higher Education system.

Joseph Jenkins sympathized with the Presidents and the fact they are lacking funding to run their programs. He hoped they would continue to fund O&M as it is anticipated and not use the funding for other programs.

Mark Spencer stated sought the President's comments on the issue since they were funding O&M out of other pockets since enough O&M was not appropriated. The requests were appropriate for the new buildings, but there have been no inflationary increases. Kenneth Nye commented DFCM has had some discussion regarding O&M and encouraged the Regents to address O&M as part of the funding formula. Currently, one of the methods institutions can use to receive additional O&M costs is when a building is renovated or replaced; increased O&M is requested. Including O&M in a formula process may address

the issue more globally than just on the individual projects.

☐ **OTHER**

Chair Keith Stepan stated there was a concern on the part of DFCM and the Building Board about spreading the educational facilities in terms of new campuses and keeping a watchful eye about realizing the buildings cost a lot of money but that is just a piece of the puzzle in terms of new campuses with new infrastructure and facilities that are not required. He cautioned the institutions to be watchful and careful about the process of spreading educational facilities across the State versus more of a cluster approach in terms of dollars.

Representative Loraine Pace stated her perception is that any group appointed by the Governor ends up in an adversarial relationship with the Legislature and that is unfortunate because the Board could provide an expertise that the Legislators did not have the time to develop. She encouraged everyone to aid the Legislators in understanding some of the critical issues. In addition to building buildings, the institutions needed to ensure the faculty could be afforded to handle the increase in student load. She also discussed phase funding and felt some projects would not exist without phase funding. She felt if phase funding was done responsibly within a two year cycle, it could be done easily, however the current economy made funding any project very difficult. She applauded both Boards for their actions and asked for their help in understanding their needs to better help the Committee understand.

Senator Beverly Evans stated it was absolutely critical to maintain and operate the buildings with adequate AR&I and O&M. In going back through the prioritization process, there was not the opportunity to interface with the Capital Facilities Committee. The dialogue with the Building Board over the last few years has greatly helped in understanding the process by which they have made the prioritizations. The Capital Facilities Subcommittee has developed a fairly strong alliance and working relationship with the Building Board but oftentimes leadership makes decisions out of the capital facilities arena. She expressed the importance of contacting the Legislators in each of their regions. There is also an interesting budgeting process with UCAT which will need to be further grappled with as roles are assumed in how to proceed with the funding and how to manage UCAT expansions and operations. She appreciated the input and interface from the Boards in keeping the communication open.

☐ **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Karras thanked the Building Board and DFCM for their participation in the meeting.

The meeting concluded at 9:32am.

Minutes prepared by: Shannon Lofgreen